To: Lin Fritschi[lin.fritschi@curtin.edu.au]; Kromhout, J. (Hans)[h.kromhout@uu.nl]; [redacted] Egeghy, Peter[Egeghy.Peter@epa.gov]
From: Dana Loomis
Sent: Mon 5/4/2015 7:04:00 AM
Subject: RE: Monograph 112: Question about Johnson (2005) reference

Dear All,

My email to the author was returned as undeliverable, so I have left the units as they were and added a Working Group noting that the values are much higher and may be for total spray fluid, rather than glyphosate.

I think that's all we can do.

Dana

From: Lin Fritschi [lin.fritschi@curtin.edu.au]
Sent: 29 April 2015 02:02
To: Dana Loomis; Kromhout, J. (Hans); Teresa Rodriguez; Egeghy, Peter
Subject: RE: Monograph 112: Question about Johnson (2005) reference

I believe Hans thinks they might be right as they are. His email said:

They measured spray-fluid if I remember well and not just the AI glyphosate. Given a common formulation of 360 g/l it's no saurprise these concentrations should be higher. Also they reported a median of non-zero values which will additionally move the average upwards.

-----Original Message-----
From: Dana Loomis [mailto:LoomisD@iarc.fr]
Sent: Tuesday, 28 April 2015 4:25 PM
To: Kromhout, J. (Hans); Lin Fritschi; Teresa Rodriguez; Egeghy, Peter
Subject: Re: Monograph 112: Question about Johnson (2005) reference

Thanks everyone. I guess that Pete is probably right. They did measure spray fluid in the dermal exposure assessment, but the air measurements were supposedly glyphosate, which would also make sense if the analysis was by GC/MS.

I will try to write to the author as Lin suggested, but the paper is more than 10 years old, so if he doesn¹t respond or can¹t resolve the question, would you be comfortable assuming that the units in mg are a typo and should be µg? A footnote could be added to indicate this.

Dana

On 28/04/2015 09:38, "Kromhout, J. (Hans)" <h.kromhout@uu.nl> wrote:

>Hi Dana et al.,,
>
>They measured spray-fluid if I remember well and not just the AI
>glyphosate. Given a common formulation of 360 g/l it's no saurprise
>these concentrations should be higher. Also they reported a median of
>non-zero values which will additionally move the average upwards.
>
>Hope this helps, Hans

>_____
>From: Lin Fritschi [lin.fritschi@curtin.edu.au]
>Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2015 1:56 AM
>To: Dana Loomis; Teresa Rodriguez; Kromhout, J. (Hans); Egeghy, Peter
>Subject: RE: Monograph 112: Question about Johnson (2005) reference
>
>Hmm, does seem strange. Should we email the author?
>
>From: Dana Loomis [mailto:LoomisD@iarc.fr]
>Sent: Monday, 27 April 2015 10:39 PM
>To: Teresa Rodriguez; Hans Kromhout; Lin Fritschi; Egeghy, Peter
>Subject: Monograph 112: Question about Johnson (2005) reference
>
>Dear Group 1,
>
>The data on air concentrations in this paper, which is cited in Table
>1.2 of the glyphosate monograph, look very strange. At first glance,
>the values look similar to the ones reported in other papers, but the
>units given in this paper are mg/m3, whereas all the others are in
>µg/m3. If the concentrations in Johnson were converted to µg/m3, the
>mean for the first group of workers would be 16,000 µg/m3, which seems improbably
>high. Your thoughts would be appreciated.
>
>Dana